

**MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING
LANE COVE COUNCIL
Thursday 26th September 2024
10.30am**

DRP PANEL MEMBERS

Peter St Clair	Chairperson	Architect
Sam Crawford	Panel Member	Architect
Elina Braunstein	Panel Member	Urban Designer

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES

Darren Waters	Lane Cove and Mowbray Anglican Churches
Jennifer Cooper	Traders in Purple
Charlie Daoud	Traders in Purple
Wendy Shi	Plus Architecture
Rido Pin	Plus Architecture
Charlie Robinson	Land and Form
Runshi Liu	Land and Form
Richard Huyuh	Sustainable Development Group
Tom Goode	Planning & Co

COUNCIL STAFF

Mark Brisby	Director Planning and Sustainability
Rajiv Shankar	Manager, Development Assessment
Chris Shortt	Senior Town Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

COUNCIL OBSERVERS

None

APOLOGIES

Timothy Williams	Panel Member	Architect/heritage
------------------	--------------	--------------------

ITEM DETAILS

Property Address: 2-8 Finlayson St & 10 Finlayson St Lane Cove
Planning Officer: Chris Shortt
Owner: Anglican Church Property Diocese of Sydney/Loftex Pty Ltd
Applicant: Traders in Purple
Proposal: Proposed 8 storey residential flat building for approximately 47 units and 2 level basement parking for 142 vehicles, church facilities, auditorium and associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

CS and PSC welcomed the Applicants and Design Team. PSC provided an acknowledgement of country. All Panel members, Council staff and Applicant's representatives introduced themselves and described their respective project roles. TW was unable to attend the meeting in person, however had previously reviewed the documents and provided comment.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Attending Panel members had separately indicated that there were no conflicts of interest.

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The Panel is engaged by Council to provide independent and impartial advice on the design of development proposals and applications to lift the design quality of projects. The Panel's comments and recommendations are intended to assist Council in their design consideration of an application against SEPP 65 principles and where relevant the requirements of the Lane Cove LEP 2009 and Lane Cove DCP. The absence of a comment under a particular heading does not imply that particular matter to be satisfactorily addressed, more likely the changes are suggested under other principles to generate a desirable change.

Your attention is drawn to the following;

- SEPP 65, including the 9 Design Quality Principles and the requirements for a Qualified Designer (a Registered Architect) to provide Design Verification Statements throughout the design, documentation, and construction phases of the project.
- The Apartment Design Guide (ADG), as published by Planning NSW (July 2015), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed below.

Both documents are available from the NSW Department of Planning.

1. To address the Panel's comments, the applicant may need to submit amended plans. Prior to preparing any amended plans or attending additional Panel presentations, the applicant must discuss the Panel's comments and any other matter that may require amendment with Council's assessing Planning Officer.
2. When addressing the Panel's comments by way of amendments, if the applicant does not propose to address all or the bulk of the Panel's comments and wishes to make minor amendments only, then it should be taken that the Panel considers the proposal does not meet the SEPP 65 requirements. In these instances, it is unlikely the scheme will be referred to the Panel for further review.

4.0 DESIGN REVIEW

4.1 Presentation

The applicant and design team were invited to present the Pre-DA proposal for the subject sites. RP and CR presented an architectural proposal dated 19/09/24 and landscape proposal dated 17/09/24.

4.2 Panel comments and recommendations

The Panel commends the applicant, council and the design team on the project initiative, which aims to provide a vibrant mixed-use development and new publicly accessible facilities, including a large auditorium, for use by both the church and council sponsored users.

The following advice is based upon the proposed amalgamation of sites to develop an 8 storey mixed use development, inclusive of new publicly accessible auditorium. Any design impacts on the proposal, due to future changes to planning controls, would need to be separately considered. Items from DRP #1 have not been repeated below. This is not an indication that these items have been fully addressed by the applicant.

4.2.1 Principle 1 Context and Neighbourhood Character

No additional comments.

4.2.2 Principle 2 Built Form and Scale

The Panel provides the following comments and recommendations:

- The massing strategy has been refined to deliver height emphasis of the corner of Rosenthal Avenue and Finlayson Street which provides clarity to the overall built form.
- Based on previous comments provided by the Panel in relation to the form erosion of the lower floor levels, the scheme has been redesigned to express the podium as a defined form to complement the character and rhythm of the streetscape.
- The Panel expressed support for the face brick treatment which appears to be informed by the recent streetscape analysis.
- The built form relationship between the heritage item and the new fabric has been strengthened with recent design amendments. At street level, this arrangement ensures the church hall is integrated into the spatial entry sequence, on arrival from Rosenthal Ave. An appreciation for the importance of daylight intake to celebrate the heritage fabric has informed recent design updates. The approach is generally supported by the Panel.
- The panel recommends further design testing of the façade element immediately over the main entry from Rosenthal Ave. It may be desirable to reflect/ express within the façade, the angled soffit to the lobby adjacent the heritage church roof.

4.2.3 Principle 3 Density

The proposal continues to seek a substantial variation to the maximum height of buildings and FSR applicable to the site. To ensure cohesive streetscape and urban form outcomes, impacts associated with the additional bulk and scale should be documented. Therefore, the Panel repeated the request for accurate street sections demonstrating the scale and visual prominence of the proposed 8 storey scale (on an elevated site), against the 'sunken' 5 storey sites fronting the northern side of Finlayson Street.

In elevation, the scale presented by the raised 8 storey form to the pedestrian environment, would likely be approximately 4 storeys taller than existing development, which given the sloping topography and pedestrian view lines from areas along Birdwood Avenue and the car park deck of the shopping centre, may well be visually intrusive to the visual character of the area. The sections should depict the actual scale and existing ground levels of existing development to the north (which, in the previous presentation package, was depicted as presenting 5 storeys to the street – which does not appear to be accurate).

4.2.4 Principle 4 Sustainability and Heritage

The principles of the heritage design are generally supported.

The simplicity of the floor planning, the entry sequence and use of the remnant church hall as a pre-event space are considered a positive development.

The sloping ceiling that opens up towards the church is positive, however it may be better if this happened at the Rosenthal facade and did not slope the other way at the entrance. This

would make the relationship between the new and old more dynamic and emphasise the significance of the church on the street elevation. Consideration could be given to extending the same sloped ceiling all the way through the entry space.

The kitchenette was not seen as appropriate in the entrance space. It was suggested this either be relocated or alternatively designed as a bespoke joinery element that can be closed up.

4.2.5 Principle 5 Landscape

The principles of the landscape design are generally supported, however need further development. The Panel provides the following comments and recommendations:

- Retention of the existing tree on the corner of Finlayson Street is considered an improvement, however it is unfortunate the proposal only has the capacity to retain a single tree within the boundaries of the site. Arborist advice on tree retention should be provided throughout construction, so as to ensure survival of this important canopy tree.
- The communal open space area is slightly short of the ADG minimum requirement (25%). The current calculations rely on approximately 40% of the area being counted as communal open space, being located in the front setback along Finlayson Street. Many of these areas do not appear to be suitable for passive recreation and/or social interaction. The Panel therefore strongly encouraged the applicant team to consider opportunities to provide additional communal open space on the roof of the auditorium. Due to the shortfall in common outdoor space, and the visual impact of the auditorium roofscape on the south facing bedrooms, the rooftop area is considered an opportunity to strengthen the landscape character and visual amenity of the site.
- The Panel expressed concerns relating to the configuration of the communal open space at the south-western corner of the site. The area appears to include a considerable amount of fill which is likely to compromise the cross boundary relationship and the interface to No 12 Finaly St. The adjoining property is likely to remain undeveloped in the mid-to long term and therefore, the proposal must consider and demonstrate how overbearing bulk and increased sense of enclosure can be minimised for the neighbouring dwelling. The Panel repeated the request for scaled sections capturing the existing vs. proposed levels along the western site edge. Existing ground levels should be indicated on all sectional drawings, to enable an assessment of potential impacts relating to the extent of cut and fill (i.e. overlooking, visual enclosure etc).
- More large scale local trees could be planted in the deep soil zone.

4.2.6 Principle 6 Amenity

- The unit layouts are generally better resolved and the façade grain is improved with recent amendments. The plan arrangement of apartment 04.02 should be reviewed to provide improved access to daylight within the “snorkel” bedroom.
- The 3 bedroom units located in the south-western corner of the site have poor amenity with very limited outlook and daylight access. The units should be reconfigured to improve internal amenity while minimising adverse impacts to neighbouring properties and from the communal outdoor space. In particular, the amenity/outlook from within the south facing bedrooms of apartments 01.W05 and 01.W01 has the potential to be severely compromised by the resolution of the roof over the hall (adjacent/ below). Section A does not take into account the likely depth or fall required to the hall roof structure. Furthermore the third bedroom in apartments

01.W05 and 01.W01, as well as those immediately over and on the remaining levels should be clearly identified and have access to daylight/ views out.

- Consideration should be given to the floor area of the lobbies to the hall, when compared to the floor area/ capacity of the hall, so as to ensure that there is sufficient space for event attendees gathering pre and post-show/ event/ service. The Applicant noted that the reception joinery will likely be movable to free this space up for large events.

4.2.7 Principle 7 Safety

No additional comments.

4.2.8 Principle 8 Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

- On the Upper Ground Floor, the area which was previously nominated for “retail uses” has been amended to include “Flexible Ministry” uses. The Panel questioned whether the area could accommodate a small café, to compliment the public use component within the development and encourage engagement with the street.

4.2.9 Principle 9 Aesthetics

- The clear articulation of the podium as an element distinct from the residential apartments above is supported. However the Panel questioned whether the brick arches are the appropriate geometry for the podium and recommends the applicant explore a simplification of the various podium treatments where possible.

5.0 OUTCOME

The Panel has determined the outcome of the DRP review and provides final direction to the Applicant as follows:

- The Panel provides qualified support for the proposal, subject to resolution of the issues detailed under each Principle and the submission of more detailed drawings and reports to Council. The need for an additional design review can be determined by council.